

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 23, 26, 28, 38, 39, 40, and 42. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 23-44 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 23-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant has amended the subject claims and respectfully submits that the claims are now directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 23-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith, et al (WO 98/56160). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims.

The Applicant's invention uses forced booking to solve inter-service credit deadlocks. Reservations at service capability servers are made in "units" for various users according to the amount of units presently in an account (more than one user per account). At a point in time, there may be unit reservations that are currently unused in the service capability servers, so the system forces the servers to book (apply to the users account) used credits, not previously booked, to determine a current balance of unused credits. For instance, in a WAP service being provisioned for a mobile station account, a PC requests email service and maybe more users associated with the account request other services; all using the same account. The credit management system may determine that there are not enough unreserved units to make unit reservations for service use. The credit management system of the present invention forces booking of all the credits that are already consumed by the 'online' users that haven't been applied to the account balance, which releases all the outstanding reservations. Then the system submits new reservation requests (Summary). So, in the

present invention the last request will force all services that have reserved credits to book (or apply) only actually used units and free up the unused credit (units) that were reserved. After that, new requests can be made and the bandwidth connection service then has a higher priority.

The Smith reference discloses the regular process of reserving and booking credits. A portion of a value is withdrawn from a subscriber's pre-paid account. A withdrawal of a second portion from the subscriber's pre-paid account can be made responsive to receipt of a second transaction request if available. The second transaction is processed, in parallel with the first transaction, in response to the second transaction request if the request approval step is approved. Smith, in summary, withdraws a first amount from the account based on an estimate of the call length and if the value left in the account is large enough to cover a second withdrawal request, a second amount is withdrawn and allocated to cover the ongoing call. Once the call is completed, any remainder of the allocated amount is returned to the pre-paid account. Consequently, if a parallel transaction takes place, the account value made available for this transaction may be less than or equal to the actual current account value.

The Smith reference does not disclose forced booking as Smith does not address the problem that the present invention addresses. As amended, independent claims 23 and 42 disclose forced booking, which frees up previously reserved, but unused, units associated with a particular account so that more than one server can provide a service and more than one user can access a service. Smith does not address the problem of multiple services reserving credits associated with a common account (maybe different users having the same account) where a late arriving service will not be able to run because credits are not reserved for the late service. Nor does Smith address the problem of multiple users accessing one or more services from the same account.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Smith does not anticipate the independent claims 23 and 42, as amended, and as such does not anticipate the respective dependent claims 24-41 and 43-44. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 5, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com